APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/555,057	07/10/2000	TAKESHI KUMAZAWA	1046.1213/JD	6782

21171   7590   04/06/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/555,057	KUMAZAWA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Peng Ke	2174

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 12/29/04.

This Action is Final.

2.   Claims 1-43 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 30, and 37 are

independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
>
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
>
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
>
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
>
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-39, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Straub et al. (US 6,216,141) in view of Nawaz et al. (US 5,959,621).

As per claim 1 Straub et al. teaches an object display device comprising:

a converter means for converting a representative character string of source data

containing character strings into image data defined as an object (Fig 5, item 140, col 8, lines 35-

44);

a storage means for storing the source data and the image in a manner of relating these

pieces of data to each other (fig 1, item 40); and

a display means for displaying the image data on a display area of the display means (fig 1, item 30).

Wherein a user selects the image data from the display area and the display means displays the selected image data on a user selected stationary display area (Examiner interprets the default browser or stand browser to be user selected browser) separate from the moving display area (col. 9, lines 47-60).

However, Straub et al. fails to teach a moving display area on the display mean.

Nawaz et al teaches a display mean having a moving display area (col. 8, lines 46-53).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Nawaz et al.'s teaching with Straub et al.'s object in order to display data in a continuous and seamless manner.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 1. Straub further teaches the method comprising the display means for displaying the source data linked to when the image data displayed is designated (col. 8, lines 35-44).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 1. Straub further teaches the method wherein the image data is structured such that the character string is converted into a bitmap and thus laid out on an background image (col. 8, lines 17-25).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 3. Straub further teaches the wherein the image data has a

window, provided along a periphery of the background image, for showing an attribute of the

source data to which the image data is linked (fig 5, item 140, col. 8, lines 35-44).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object

display device according to claim 4. Straub further teaches the method wherein said display

means displays the image data together with the window, of which a frame size differs

corresponding to a capacity of the source data to which the image data is linked (fig 5, item 140,

fig 6, item 170). The source data links to a web site that is displayed on browser, which takes up

an entire monitor screen.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object

display device according to claim 4. Straub further teaches the method comprising template

images of plural types of windows, of which frame sizes are different, wherein said template

corresponding to a capacity of the source data is used (col. 15, lines 19-28).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 4, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object

display device according to claim 4. Straub further teaches the method wherein said display

means displays the image data together with the window of which a frame configuration differs

corresponding to the number of hours or days since the time when the source data to which the

image data is linked was acquired (col. 13, lines 43-49). Since the document is being updated

after a period of time, it is inherent that the configuration would be different corresponding to the

number of hours and days.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 4, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object

display device according to claim 4. Straub further teaches the method comprising template

images of plural types of windows, of which frame configurations are different, wherein said

template corresponding to the number of hours or days since the time when the source data was acquired (col 13, lines 43-49). Since the document is being updated after a period of time, it is inherent the configuration of the frame would be adjusted based on the size of the document.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 1. Nawaz et al. teaches the method comprising the display means for displaying in movement plural pieces of image data corresponding to respective pieces of source data in predetermined areas (col. 8, lines 24-34).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Nawza et al further teaches a selector means for selecting a desired piece of image data from the image data displayed in movement; and the display means for displaying the selected image data in an area excluding the display area (col 9, lines 9-25) .

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Nawaz et al. further teaches an object display device according to claim 10, wherein the source data linked is displayed on said display means when the image data displayed is designated (col 9, lines 9-25).

As per claim 12, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (see rejection above).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 13, it is of the same scope as claim 7. (see rejection above)

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 12, it is of the same scope as claim 9. (see rejection above).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 12, Straub et al. and Nawaz et al. teach an object display method according to claim 12. Nawaz et al. further teaches the object display method comprising: a step of selecting a desired piece of image data from the image data displayed in movement; and a step of displaying the selected image data in an area excluding the display area (col 8, lines 24-34, col 9, lines 9-25).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Nawaz et al.'s teaching with Straub et al.'s object in order to display data in a continuous and seamless manner.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, Straub et al. teaches an object display method according to claim 17, further comprising a step of displaying the source data linked on said display means when the image data displayed is designated (col 9, lines 9-25).

As per independent claim 19, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 1, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 1. Straub teaches the method further comprising a set means for setting an effective period as attribute information with respect to the source data, wherein said converter means for conversion into the image data does not convert the source data, which has an elapse over the effective period into the image data (col. 13, lines 43-49).

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 2, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 2. Straub teaches the method further wherein the previous image data is not displayed when the source data is displayed on said display means upon the designation of the image data (col 9, lines 47-54).

As per independent claim 23, Straub et al. teaches an object display device comprising: a display means for displaying plural pieces of information in a manner of sequentially changing a display content (fig 5, item 140, col 8, lines 35-44);

a detect means for detecting a predetermined user's operation for the information displayed (col 8, lines 35-44);

and a record means for recording the information operated in accordance with the detection of the users' operation (col 5, lines 12-25).

Wherein a user selects the image data from a display area and a stationary display area separate from the moving display area and (col. 6, lines 45-55; Standard browser is stationary display is different from teaser) the display means displays the selected image data on a stationary display area separate from the moving display area (col. 9, lines 47-60).

However, Straub et al. fails to teach a moving display area on the display mean.

Nawaz et al teaches a display mean having a moving display area (col. 8, lines 46-53).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Nawaz et al.'s teaching with Straub et al.'s object in order to display data in a continuous and seamless manner.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 23, it is of the same scope as claim 9. (see rejection above).

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 23, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 23. Straub et al. further teaches the method wherein the information is displayed in a predetermined display format on said display means as the record of the information (col. 9, lines 47-54).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 23, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 23. Straub et al. further teaches the method further comprising: the detect means for detecting a selection indicating operation with respect to the information recorded; and the display means for displaying linked information corresponding to the information subjected to the selection indication operation (col 9, lines 47-54).

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 27. Straub et al. further teaches the method wherein the linked information is source data, and said object display device further comprises means for creating the information displayed by an extraction from the source data. (col 9, lines 47-54)

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, Straub et al teaches an object display device according to claim 28. Straub et al. further teaches the method wherein the source data belongs to a remote terminal connected via a network (col 9, lines 55-60).

As per claim 30, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 23. (see rejection above)

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 30, it is of the same scope as claim 9. (see rejection above).

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 30, it is of the same scope as claim 25. (see rejection above)

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 30, Straub et al. and Nawaz et al. teach an object display method according to claim 30. Straub et al. teaches the method further comprising:

detecting a selection indicating operation with respect to the information recorded (col 8, lines 35-44); and

displaying linked information corresponding to the information subjected to the selection indication operation (col 8, lines 35-44).

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 34, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display method according to claim 34. Straub et al. teaches the method wherein the linked information is source data, and said object display method further comprises a step of creating the information displayed by an extraction from the source data (col 9, lines 48-54).

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 35, it is of the same scope as claim 29. (see rejection above)

As per independent claim 37, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 23. (see rejection above)

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, it is of the same scope as claim 17 (see rejection above).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach a readable-by-computer recording medium recorded with a program according to claim 37. Straub et al. further teaches the method wherein said step of recording the information includes a step of displaying the information in a predetermined display format on said display means (col 3, lines 35-40).

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 37, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach a readable-by-computer recording medium recorded with a program according to claim 37. Straub et al. teaches the method further comprising:

detecting a selection indicating operation with respect to the information recorded (col 9, lines 48-60); and

displaying linked information corresponding to the information subjected to the selection indication operation (col. 9, lines 48-60).

As per claim 42, which is dependent on claim 41, Straub et al. and Nawaz teach a readable-by-computer recording medium recorded with a program according to claim 41. Straub further teaches method wherein the linked information is source data, and said program further comprises a step of creating the information displayed by an extraction from the source data (col. 9, lines 48-60).

As per claim 43, which is dependent on clam 42 is of the same scope as claim 29. (see rejection above)

4.   Claims 26, 33, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al (US 6,216,141) in view of Nawaz et al. (US 5,959,621) further in view of Kisiel (US 6,327,586).

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 23. Straub et al. and Nawaz teach an object display device according to claim 23. However they fail to teach the object wherein the operation is a drag-and-drop operation aiming at a desired piece of information. Kisiel teaches an object wherein the operation is a drag-and-drop operation aiming at a desired piece of information (col 9, lines 40-48).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kisiel's

teaching with the device of Straub and Nawaz in order to provide a friendly user interface that

simplifies the open file procedure.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 30, it is of the same scope as claim 26. (see

rejection above)

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 37, it is of the same scope as claim 26. (see

rejection above)

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/29/04 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant's arguments focused on the following:

1) Straub et al. fails to teach a converter means for converting a representative character

string of source data containing character strings into image data defined as an object"

1) Examiner disagrees. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given

*>their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211

F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in

light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In*

re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant always has the

opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner

reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is

justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969)

In this case, examiner interprets browser to be the view to be a converter and HTML source code to be source data. Straub teaches using the internet browser to convert HTML into image data are displayed to user. (See Straub, col. 8, lines 26-44)

2) Straub et al. fails to teach "a storage means for storing the source data and the image data in a manner of relating these piece of data to each other."

2) Examiner disagrees. Straub teaches this limitation because Straub uses a user-preference storage to store user preferred HTML document (col. 10, lines 58-68), which in includes text documents and image documents. (col. 8, lines 26-44) Therefore, text documents and image documents are related because they are all user preferred documents.

3) Applicant argues Straub fails to teach that the stationary display is separate from the moving display area.

3) Straub suggests that the stationary display is separate from its invention the teaser (col. 9, lines 55-60), because the stationary display is a standard web browser. The web browser is a separate application from the teaser (col. 9, lines 46-69)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100